

CAUSE NO. 096-297222-18


EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION,                   §                   IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
  §  
  §                   TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS  
*Petitioner.*                                   §  
  §                   96th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

*AW*

**PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

On January 8, 2018, Exxon Mobil Corporation (“ExxonMobil”) filed a petition under Rule 202 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure seeking pre-suit discovery to evaluate potential claims and preserve evidence related to constitutional violations, abuse of process, and civil conspiracy. ExxonMobil’s potential claims arise from an alleged conspiracy by California municipalities to suppress Texas-based speech and associational activities on climate policy that are out-of-step with the prevailing views of California public officials. According to ExxonMobil’s petition, the California municipalities alleged facts in their lawsuits against the Texas energy sector that are contradicted by contemporaneous disclosures to municipal bond investors. ExxonMobil seeks pre-suit discovery on whether the lawsuits were brought in bad faith as a pretext to suppress Texas-based speech and associational activities by members of Texas’s energy sector.

The potential defendants and prospective witnesses named in ExxonMobil’s petition (collectively the “Respondents”) challenged this Court’s personal jurisdiction by filing special appearances under Rule 120a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. ExxonMobil opposed. Both the Respondents and ExxonMobil filed affidavits and evidence in support of their respective positions. At a hearing held on March 8, 2018, the Court accepted all filed affidavits and evidence, as permitted by Rule 120a. Neither ExxonMobil nor the Respondents objected to the evidence at

 **E-MAILED**  
*All Counsel*  
*4/25/18*

the hearing; the parties disputed only the legal significance of the uncontested factual record before the Court. On March 14, 2018, the Court denied all of the special appearances in light of the factual record.

On March 27, 2018, ExxonMobil filed a request for findings of fact and conclusions of law supporting this Court's denial of the special appearances. In accordance with Rule 297 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law based on the uncontested evidentiary record.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

#### **A. Parties**

1. Petitioner ExxonMobil is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business in Texas. It formulates and issues statements about climate change from its headquarters in Texas. Most of its corporate records pertaining to climate change are located in Texas, and it engages in speech and associational activities in Texas.

2. Potential Defendants the County of San Mateo, the County of Marin, the City of Imperial Beach, the City of Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, the City of Oakland, and the City of San Francisco are cities or counties in California that do not maintain a registered agent, telephone listing, or post office box in Texas.

3. Potential Defendants Barbara J. Parker, Dennis J. Herrera, John Beiers, Serge Dedina, Jennifer Lyon, Brian Washington, Dana McRae, and Anthony Condotti are California municipal officers who do not reside in Texas or maintain offices or registered agents in Texas.

4. Potential Defendant Matthew F. Pawa is an attorney in private practice,

based in Massachusetts and serving as outside counsel for Potential Defendants the City of Oakland and the City of San Francisco. Mr. Pawa does not maintain an office or registered agent in Texas and is not licensed to practice law in Texas.

5. Prospective Witnesses Sabrina B. Landreth, Edward Reiskin, John Maltbie, Andy Hall, Matthew Hymel, Carlos Palacios, and Martín Bernal are California municipal officers who do not reside in Texas or maintain a registered agent, telephone listing, or post office box in Texas.

**B. Preparatory Activities Directed at Texas-Based Speech**

*Pawa and Others Develop a Climate Change Strategy*

6. In June 2012, Potential Defendant Pawa and a group ~~of special interests~~ <sup>RAW</sup> attended a conference in La Jolla, California, called the “Workshop on Climate Accountability, Public Opinion, and Legal Strategies.” Peter Frumhoff, the Director of Science and Policy for the Union of Concerned Scientists; Naomi Oreskes, then a professor at the University of California, San Diego; and Richard Heede, of the Climate Accountability Institute, conceived of this workshop and invited Mr. Pawa to participate as a featured speaker.

7. During the conference, participants discussed strategies to “[w]in [a]ccess to [i]nternal [d]ocuments” of energy companies, like ExxonMobil, that could be used to obtain leverage over these companies. The conference participants concluded that using law enforcement powers and civil litigation to “maintain[ ] pressure on the industry that could eventually lead to its support for legislative and regulatory responses to global warming.” One commentator observed, “Even if your ultimate goal might be to shut down a company, you still might be wise to start out by asking for compensation for injured parties.”

8. At the conference, the attendees also concluded that “a single sympathetic

state attorney general might have substantial success in bringing key internal documents to light.”

9. At the conference, Potential Defendant Pawa targeted ExxonMobil’s speech on climate change, and identified such speech as a basis for bringing litigation. Mr. Pawa claimed that “Exxon and other defendants distorted the truth” (as Mr. Pawa saw it) and that litigation “serves as a ‘potentially powerful means to change corporate behavior.’” Myles Allen, another participant at the La Jolla conference, claimed that “the fossil fuel industry’s disinformation has effectively muted a large portion of the electorate.”

10. In January 2016, Mr. Pawa engaged <sup>participants</sup> ~~special interests~~ <sup>AMW</sup> at the Rockefeller Family Fund offices in New York City to further solidify the “[g]oals of an Exxon campaign” that Mr. Pawa developed at the La Jolla conference. According to a draft agenda for the meeting, the goals of this campaign included: (i) “[t]o establish in [the] public’s mind that Exxon is a corrupt institution that has pushed humanity (and all creation) toward climate chaos and grave harm”; (ii) “[t]o delegitimize [ExxonMobil] as a political actor”; (iii) “[t]o drive divestment from Exxon”; and (iv) “[t]o force officials to disassociate themselves from Exxon, their money, and their historic opposition to climate progress, for example by refusing campaign donations, refusing to take meetings, calling for a price on carbon, etc.”

11. According to the draft agenda, Mr. Pawa and the other participants aimed to chill and suppress ExxonMobil’s speech through “legal actions & related campaigns,” including “AGs” and “Tort[]” suits. The draft agenda notes that participants planned to use “AGs” and “Tort[]” suits to “get[] discovery” and “creat[e] scandal.”

*State Attorneys General Adopt the Climate Change Strategy*

12. On March 29, 2016, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey, and other state attorneys general, calling

themselves the “Green 20,” held a press conference where they promoted regulating the speech of energy companies, including ExxonMobil, whom they perceived as an obstacle to enacting their preferred policy responses to climate change. Attorneys General Schneiderman and Healey discussed their investigations of ExxonMobil. They were also joined by former Vice President Al Gore, an investor in alternative energy companies.

13. At the press conference, Attorney General Schneiderman discussed the need to regulate the energy industry’s speech on climate change, just as Potential Defendant Pawa had urged at La Jolla and at the Rockefeller meeting. He stated, “There is no dispute but there is confusion, and confusion sowed by those with an interest in profiting from the confusion and creating misperceptions in the eyes of the American public that really need to be cleared up.” Attorney General Schneiderman denounced the “highly aggressive and morally vacant forces that are trying to block every step by the federal government to take meaningful action” and announced that “today, we’re sending a message that, at least some of us—actually a lot of us—in state government are prepared to step into this battle with an unprecedented level of commitment and coordination.”

14. Attorney General Healey similarly echoed themes from the strategy Mr. Pawa developed at La Jolla. She stated, “Part of the problem has been one of public perception,” and she blamed “[f]ossil fuel companies” for purportedly causing “many to doubt whether climate change is real and to misunderstand and misapprehend the catastrophic nature of its impacts.” Attorney General Healey announced that those who “deceived” the public “should be, must be, held accountable.” In the next sentence, she disclosed that she too had begun investigating ExxonMobil and concluded, before receiving a single document from ExxonMobil, that there was a “troubling disconnect between what Exxon knew . . . and what the company and industry chose

to share with investors and with the American public.”

15. At the press conference, former Vice President Al Gore praised Attorney General Schneiderman’s efforts to “hold to account those commercial interests” who “are now trying to convince people that renewable energy is not a viable option,” ~~a position that aligned well with Mr. Gore’s financial stake in renewable energy companies.~~ Mr. Gore also focused on First Amendment-protected activities, condemning the “political and lobbying efforts” of the traditional energy industry. RWJ

*State Attorneys General Conceal Ties to Pawa*

16. At a closed-door meeting held before the March 2016 press conference, Mr. Pawa and Dr. Frumhoff conducted briefings for assembled members of the attorneys general’s offices. Mr. Pawa, whose briefing was on “climate change litigation,” has subsequently admitted to attending the meeting, but only after he and the attorneys general attempted and failed to conceal it.

17. The New York Attorney General’s Office attempted to keep Mr. Pawa’s involvement in this meeting secret. When a reporter contacted Mr. Pawa shortly after this meeting and inquired about the press conference, the Chief of the Environmental Protection Bureau at the New York Attorney General’s Office told Mr. Pawa, “My ask is if you speak to the reporter, to not confirm that you attended or otherwise discuss the event.”

18. Similarly, the Vermont Attorney General’s Office—another member of the “Green 20” coalition—admitted at a court hearing that when it receives a public records request to share information concerning the coalition’s activities, it researches the party who requested the records, and upon learning of the requester’s affiliation with “coal or Exxon or whatever,” the office “give[s] this some thought . . . before [it] share[s] information with this entity.”

***State Attorneys General Target Texas-based  
Speech, Activities, and Property***

19. Attorney General Schneiderman issued a subpoena and Attorney General Healey issued a civil investigative demand (“CID”) to ExxonMobil requesting documents and communications concerning climate change and expressly referencing documents in ExxonMobil’s possession in Texas.

20. The Massachusetts CID targets specific statements ExxonMobil and its executives made in Texas. For example, it requests documents concerning (i) a 1982 article prepared by the Coordination and Planning Division of Exxon Research and Engineering Company; (ii) former Chairman and CEO Rex Tillerson’s “statements regarding Climate Change and Global Warming . . . at an Exxon shareholder meeting in Dallas, Texas”; (iii) ExxonMobil’s 2016 Energy Outlook, which was prepared and reviewed in Texas; and (iv) internal corporate documents and communications concerning regulatory filings prepared at ExxonMobil’s corporate offices in Texas. Many of the statements under government scrutiny pertain expressly to matters of public policy, such as remarks by ExxonMobil’s former CEO that “[i]ssues such as global poverty [are] more pressing than climate change.” The Massachusetts CID also seeks documents pertaining to ExxonMobil’s associational activities, including its communications with 12 organizations derided as climate deniers and its reasons for associating with those entities.

21. The New York subpoena also targets ExxonMobil’s speech and associational activities in Texas, including investor filings, the “*Outlook For Energy* reports,” the “*Energy Trends, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Alternative Energy* reports,” the “*Energy and Carbon - Managing the Risks Report*,” and communications with trade associations and industry groups.

22. ExxonMobil filed a lawsuit seeking injunctive and declaratory relief against

Attorneys General Schneiderman and Healey. The Attorney General of the State of Texas, along with ten other state attorneys general, filed an amicus brief in support of ExxonMobil's claims, stating that a state official's power "does not include the right to engage in unrestrained, investigative excursions to promulgate a social ideology, or chill the expression of points of view, in international policy debates." Judge Ed Kinkeade of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas questioned whether the New York and Massachusetts Attorneys General were attempting to "further their personal agendas by using the vast power of government to silence the voices of all those who disagree with them."

**C. Lawsuits Against the Texas Energy-Sector Are Directed at Texas-Based Speech, Activities, and Property**

23. With the investigations of the state attorneys general underway, Mr. Pawa next promoted his La Jolla strategy to California municipalities, as potential plaintiffs in tort litigation that would be filed against energy companies, including ExxonMobil.

24. Mr. Pawa sent a memo outlining this strategy to NextGen America, the political action group funded by political activist Tom Steyer. The memo "summarize[d] a potential legal case against major fossil fuel corporations," premised on the claim that "certain fossil fuel companies (most notoriously ExxonMobil), have engaged in a campaign and conspiracy of deception and denial on global warming." Mr. Pawa emphasized that "simply proceeding to the discovery phase would be significant" and "obtaining industry documents would be a remarkable achievement that would advance the case and the cause."

25. Mr. Pawa also gave a number of speeches in which he targeted speech that ExxonMobil formulated and made in Texas. At a 2016 conference, for instance, Mr. Pawa accused ExxonMobil of "undert[aking] a campaign of deception and denial" and targeted a speech concerning climate change delivered by former CEO Tillerson in Texas. In the same speech, Mr.



Pawa also discussed the company's internal memos from the 1980s, where company scientists evaluated potential climate change impacts.

26. Following through on the strategy Mr. Pawa outlined in his memorandum to NextGen America, Potential Defendants Parker, Herrera, and the Cities of Oakland and San Francisco filed public nuisance lawsuits against ExxonMobil and four other energy companies, including Texas-based ConocoPhillips. Mr. Pawa represents the plaintiffs in those actions, and Ms. Parker and Mr. Herrera signed the complaints on behalf of the City of Oakland and the City of San Francisco, respectively. They used an agent to serve the complaints on ExxonMobil's registered agent in California, whose role is to transmit legal process to ExxonMobil in Texas.

27. Potential Defendants Lyon, Washington, Beiers, Condotti, McRae, the City of Imperial Beach, Marin County, San Mateo County, and the City and the County of Santa Cruz filed similar public nuisance complaints against ExxonMobil and other energy companies, including the following 17 Texas-based energy companies: BP America, Inc., Shell Oil Products Company LLC, Citgo Petroleum Corp., ConocoPhillips, ConocoPhillips Company, Phillips 66, Total E&P USA Inc., Total Specialties USA Inc., Eni Oil & Gas Inc., Anadarko Petroleum Corp., Occidental Petroleum Corp., Occidental Chemical Corp., Repsol Energy North America Corp., Repsol Trading USA Corp., Marathon Oil Company, Marathon Oil Corporation, and Apache Corp. Potential Defendants Beiers, Lyon, McRae, Washington, and Condotti signed these complaints. They used an agent to serve the complaints on ExxonMobil's registered agent in Texas.

28. Each of the seven California complaints expressly target speech and associational activities in Texas.

29. The Oakland and San Francisco complaints, for example, target ExxonMobil's Texas-based speech, including a statement by "then-CEO Rex Tillerson" at

“Exxon’s annual shareholder meeting” in Texas, where they claim Mr. Tillerson allegedly “misleadingly downplayed global warming’s risks.” These complaints also target corporate statements issued from Texas, such as ExxonMobil’s “annual ‘Outlook for Energy’ reports,” “Exxon’s website,” and “Exxon’s ‘Lights Across America’ website advertisements.” In addition, the complaints target ExxonMobil’s associational activities in Texas, including corporate decisions to fund various non-profit groups that perform climate change-related research that the complaints deem to be “front groups” and “denialist groups.”

30. The City of Imperial Beach, Marin County, San Mateo County, and the City and County of Santa Cruz complaints similarly focus on ExxonMobil’s Texas-based speech and associational activities. For example, they target (i) a 1988 memo from an Exxon public affairs manager that proposes “[r]esist[ing] the overstatement and sensationalization [sic] of potential greenhouse effect”; (ii) a “publication” that “Exxon released” in “1996” with a preface by former “Exxon CEO Lee Raymond”; and (iii) a 2007 Corporate Citizenship Report, issued from the company’s Texas headquarters.

31. Each of the seven California complaints also explicitly focus on ExxonMobil property in Texas, including ExxonMobil’s internal memos and scientific research. (Imperial Beach Compl. ¶¶ 86-88, 91-92, 95-97, 99-102; Marin County Compl. ¶¶ 86-88, 91-92, 95-97, 99-102; San Mateo Compl. ¶¶ 86-88, 91-92, 95-97, 99-102; Oakland Compl. ¶¶ 60-61; San Francisco Compl. ¶¶ 60-62; County of Santa Cruz Compl. ¶¶ 130-32, 135-37, 140-42, 144-47; City of Santa Cruz Compl. ¶¶ 129-31, 134-36, 139-41, 143-46.)

32. Several Potential Defendants also made statements shortly after filing the lawsuits focusing on Texas-based speech. In a July 20, 2017 op-ed for *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, Potential Defendant Dedina, the mayor of the City of Imperial Beach, justified his

participation in this litigation by accusing the energy sector of attempting to “sow uncertainty” about climate change. In a July 26, 2017 appearance at a local radio station, Mr. Dedina accused ExxonMobil of carrying out a “merchants of doubt campaign.”

33. Oakland City Attorney Barbara Parker issued a press release soon after filing suit, asserting that “[i]t is past time to debate or question the reality of global warming.” According to Parker, “[j]ust like BIG TOBACCO, BIG OIL knew the truth long ago and peddled misinformation to con their customers and the American public.”

34. San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera similarly accused “fossil fuel companies” of launching a “disinformation campaign to deny and discredit what was clear even to their own scientists: global warming is real,” and pledged to ensure that these companies “are held to account.”

35. These allegations, <sup>RRW</sup> ~~which pervade Respondents’ lawsuits,~~ are contradicted by the Respondents’ own municipal bond disclosures. While the California municipalities alleged in their complaints against the energy companies that the impacts of climate change were knowable, quantifiable, and certain, they told their investors the exact opposite. These contradictions raise the question of whether the California municipalities brought these lawsuits for an improper purpose.

36. For example, Oakland and San Francisco’s complaints claim that ExxonMobil’s and other energy company’s “conduct will continue to cause ongoing and increasingly severe sea level rise harms” to the cities. However, the municipal bonds issued by Oakland and San Francisco disclaim knowledge of any such impending catastrophe, stating the Cities are “unable to predict” whether sea-level rise “or other impacts of climate change” will occur, and “if any such events occur, whether they will have a material adverse effect on the

business operations or financial condition of the City” or the “local economy.”

37. Similarly, according to the San Mateo Complaint, the county is “particularly vulnerable to sea level rise,” with “a 93% chance that the County experiences a devastating three-foot flood before the year 2050, and a 50% chance that such a flood occurs before 2030.” Despite this, nearly all of the county’s bond offerings contain no reference to climate change, and 2014 and 2016 bond offerings assure that “[t]he County is unable to predict whether sea-level rise or other impacts of climate change or flooding from a major storm will occur.”

38. The Imperial Beach Complaint alleges that it is vulnerable to “significant, and dangerous sea level rise” due to “unabated greenhouse gas emissions.” Imperial Beach has never warned investors in its bonds of any such vulnerability. A 2013 bond offering, for instance, contains nothing but a boilerplate disclosure that “earthquake . . . , flood, fire, or other natural disaster, could cause a reduction in the Tax Revenues securing the Bonds . . . .”

39. The Marin County complaint warns that “there is a 99% risk that the County experiences a devastating three-foot flood before the year 2050, and a 47% chance that such a flood occurs before 2030.” It also asserts that “[w]ithin the next 15 years, the County’s Bay-adjacent coast will endure multiple, significant impacts from sea level rise.” However, its bond offerings do not contain any specific references to climate change risks, noting only, for example, that “natural or manmade disaster[s], such as earthquake, flood, fire, terrorist activities, [and] toxic dumping” are potential risks.

40. The Santa Cruz complaints warn of dire climate change threats. The county alleges that there is “a 98% chance that the County experiences a devastating three-foot flood before the year 2050, and a 22% chance that such a flood occurs before 2030.” The Santa Cruz City Complaint similarly warns that “increased flooding and severe storm events associated with

climate change will result in significant structural and financial losses in the City's low-lying downtown." But none of the city or county bond offerings mention these dire and specific warnings. A 2016 county disclosure merely states that areas within the county "may be subject to unpredictable climatic conditions, such as flood, droughts and destructive storms." A 2017 city bond offering has a boilerplate message that, "[f]rom time to time, the City is subject to natural calamities," including flood and wildfire.

41. Potential Defendants Pawa, Parker, Herrera, Beiers, Dedina, Lyon, Washington, McRae, Condotti, County of San Mateo, County of Marin, City of Imperial Beach, City of Santa Cruz, County of Santa Cruz, City of Oakland, and City of San Francisco either approved or participated in filing the lawsuits against the Texas energy sector. That conduct was directed at Texas-based speech, activities, and property. Prospective Witnesses Landreth, Reiskin, Maltbie, Hall, Hymel, Palacios, and Bernal approved the contemporaneous disclosures that contradict the allegations in the municipal complaints. Those witnesses, along with the Potential Defendants, are likely to have evidence pertaining to that contradiction.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

42. Under Rule 202 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, a proper court may allow discovery of a potential claim if the court would have personal jurisdiction over the potential defendants to the anticipated suit.

43. Because this Court is not required to have personal jurisdiction over prospective witnesses who are not potential defendants, the special appearances of Prospective Witnesses Landreth, Reiskin, Maltbie, Hall, Hymel, Palacios, and Bernal are denied.

44. This Court would not have general personal jurisdiction over the Potential Defendants to the anticipated suit.

45. This Court could exercise specific personal jurisdiction over the Potential Defendants for the anticipated claims of constitutional violations, abuse of process, and civil conspiracy.

46. The exercise of personal jurisdiction over the Potential Defendants to the anticipated action would be permitted under the Texas long-arm statute, which allows a Texas court to exercise jurisdiction over nonresidents who commit a tort in whole or in part in Texas. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 17.042(2). Each of the Potential Defendants is a nonresident within the meaning of the long-arm statute.

47. A violation of First Amendment rights occurs where the targeted speech occurs or where it would otherwise occur but for the violation. ExxonMobil exercises its First Amendment rights in Texas, and Texas is the site of the speech challenged by the Potential Defendants' lawsuits. The anticipated claims therefore concern potential constitutional torts committed in Texas.

48. Exercising jurisdiction over the Potential Defendants in the anticipated action would comport with due process because the potential claims arise from minimum contacts initiated by the Potential Defendants which purposefully target Texas, including speech, activities, and property in Texas.

49. Mr. Pawa initiated contact and created a continuing relationship with Texas by, among other activities, (i) initiating a plan to use litigation to change corporate behavior of Texas-based energy companies at the La Jolla conference; (ii) engaging with the Rockefeller Family Fund to solidify and promote the goal of delegitimizing ExxonMobil as a political actor; (iii) instigating state attorneys general to commence investigations of ExxonMobil in order to obtain documents stored in Texas; and (iv) soliciting and actively promoting litigation by

California municipalities against the Texas energy industry, including ExxonMobil, to target Texas-based speech and obtain documents in Texas.

50. All of the Potential Defendants initiated contact and created a continuing relationship with Texas by (i) developing, signing, approving, and/or filing complaints that expressly target the speech, research, and funding decisions of ExxonMobil and other Texas-based energy companies to chill and affect speech, activities, and property in Texas; and (ii) using an agent to serve ExxonMobil in Texas.

51. The Potential Defendants' contacts were deliberate and purposeful, and not random, fortuitous, or attenuated.

52. Purposeful availment is satisfied where Texas is the focus of the Potential Defendants' activities and where the object of the potential conspiracy is to suppress speech and corporate behavior in Texas. *See, e.g., TV Azteca v. Ruiz*, 490 S.W.3d 29, 40 (Tex. 2016); *Hoskins v. Ricco Family Partners, Ltd.*, Nos. 02-15-00249-CV, 02-15-00253-CV, 2016 WL 2772164, at \*7 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 12, 2016).

53. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, ExxonMobil's potential claims of First Amendment violation, abuse of process, and civil conspiracy would arise from the Potential Defendants' contacts with Texas.

54. Exercising jurisdiction over the Potential Defendants for the potential claims would comport with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

55. It would not be burdensome for the Potential Defendants to litigate ExxonMobil's potential claims in Texas, and the Potential Defendants have failed to provide substantial evidence of burden.

56. Texas has a substantial state interest in adjudicating claims concerning

constitutional torts committed in Texas against Texas residents.


57. ExxonMobil has an inherent interest in obtaining convenient and effective relief by litigating its potential claims in Texas.

58. Exercising jurisdiction in this potential action would comport with the interstate judicial system's interest in obtaining the most efficient resolution of controversies because ExxonMobil's anticipated action encompasses claims and parties that are not part of the Potential Defendants' California nuisance suits and ExxonMobil has objected to the exercise of personal jurisdiction in those suits.

59. Exercising jurisdiction in this potential action would support the shared interest of the several states in furthering substantive social policies because ExxonMobil's anticipated action concerns a conspiracy to suppress and chill speech and associational activities of the Texas energy sector. Texas has an inherent interest in exercising jurisdiction over actions that concern the infringement of constitutional rights within its borders.

60. To the extent the Court's findings of fact are construed by a reviewing court to be conclusions of law or vice-versa, the incorrect designation shall be disregarded and the specified finding and/or conclusion of law shall be deemed to have been correctly designated herein.

SIGNED this 27<sup>th</sup> day of Apr 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
R.H. Wallace Jr., Presiding Judge